DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 319 896 CE 054 781

AUTHOR Cotrell, Calvin; And Others
TITLE Accountability System for Vocational Education Professional Personnel Development in Pennsylvania: A Collaborative Effort.
PUB DATE 4 Dec 88
NOTE 29p.; Panel discussion at the American Vocational Association Convention (St. Louis, MO, December 4, 1988). Pages 6-7 and 19 contain faint type.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Accountability; Cooperative Programs; Higher Education; *Inservice Education; *Organizational Development; *Professional Development; Program Evaluation; Secondary Education; *Staff Development; Vocational Education; *Vocational Education Teachers
IDENTIFIERS *Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

This document is a transcript of a panel discussion on the development and early stages of implementation of an accountability system for vocational education professional personnel development in Pennsylvania. Representatives of the Bureau of Vocational and Adult Education, Pennsylvania Department of Education, and three of the four participating universities described the project with the following objectives: (1) to develop measurable process and product objectives for each fundable personnel development center activity; (2) to design a recordkeeping system with a procedure compatible for computer application to provide cost and other pertinent data; (3) to design an instrument for collecting information from staff regarding time, travel, and other data pertinent to each center activity; and (4) to design a procedure for formative and summative evaluation of a center activity that uses both internal and external personnel. Attachments to the transcript include a project abstract, 13 currently identified fundable center objectives, a sample performance record instrument, a sample cost and service record instrument, a schedule of yearly events for the accountability system, and a roster of the project task force members. (CML)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C Cotrell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

ED319896

AVEPDA Program, AVA Convention, St. Louis, Missouri, 12/4/89

ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT IN PENNSYLVANIA: A COLLABORATIVE EFFORT

Moderator: Calvin Cotrell
Panel Members: Jackie Cullen, Edwin Herr, Thomas O'Brien and Thomas Walker

Moderator: Welcome to this AVEPDA session in which we will report on an Accountability System. I am Cal Cotrell, a retired university professor and now part-time consultant in professional personnel development.

During the 6 month period January - June 30 of this year, I had a very special and delightful experience working with a Task Force of 10 state agency and university personnel in Pennsylvania. This was the Task Force for the state financed project to develop an accountability system for the Centers for Vocational Professional Personnel Development in Pennsylvania. This project was the smallest one in dollars I can ever recall being responsible for, but it was most rewarding to me as the consultant/project director and it has great potential for the continued improvement and funding of vocational professional personnel development in Pennsylvania.
Here today to share the accountability system with you are the director of vocational and adult education - Jackie Cullen and representatives of three of the four Centers in Pennsylvania - Tom O'Brien, Director of the Center from Indiana University of Pennsylvania; Ed Herr, Director of the Center at Pennsylvania State University; and Tom Walker Co-Director of the Center at Temple University.

Why might this presentation on an accountability system be valuable to you?

If you are a <u>teacher educator</u> uncertain about future funding from the state agency or within the university, you may find a way to be more assured that the services you are rendering are better understood and appreciated.

If you are a <u>state agency person</u> concerned about how you are going to continue to convince your superiors to fund certain college or university teacher education programs, you may obtain some valuable ideas from these presentations.

The accountability system has been designed for Pennsylvania, but its various concepts and features are adaptable to any state or university professional personnel development situation. The intent of the system is to

CE054781

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

improve vocational education professional personnel development as well as to improve the accountability system itself.

One of our AVEPDA past presidents, Rupert Evans, was one of three outside reviewers for this project. It was Rupert who suggested that I contact Joyce Beach about this presentation to share the work of the Pennsylvania Task Force in the development of an accountability system.

We will be using an approach to this presentation which is, perhaps, a little bit different. I am going to be a moderator/interviewer, if you please, asking appropriate leading questions that will be answered by various members of the panel. First off, Jackie Cullen will be responding primarily to the rationale and context kinds of questions that we have about this whole system. Secondly, Tom Walker will have primary responsibility for presenting the procedures in the development of the system. Then, we will have Ed Herr present some of the products or components of the system and, finally, Tom O'Brien will be primarily responsible for questions that are relative to the implementation of the system. So, we have the story all the way from the beginning to the end. I am sure you are all concerned about implementation and I can assure you that these folks from Pennsylvania are going to have much work to do in that area. In reference to the presenters, you noticed that I mentioned "primary" responsibility for each of these four areas. That does not mean that other panel members cannot respond to a question that a particular member has been asked, if you can offer additional information which may be helpful to those in the audience. We have the potential for a state agency view, a university view and then perhaps since we have three distinct geographic regions of Pennsylvania represented here by the Center directors, you may get some information relative to differences among the three regions of Pennsylvania. After the panel has presented the context and rationale, the procedures for developing the product, and the implementation of this accountability system, there will be some time for you, the audience, to ask some questions of the panel. Perhaps you will have questions that may pertain to particular types of programs they may be offering in these Centers. I am sure the panel is ready to begin. Let's get underway with the questions. Jackie, will you give us a brief historical perspective citing the need for developing this accountability system?

JACKIE CULLEN: Let me go back to how we got to the Center concept as an example. The same kinds of questions that resulted in the development of this accountability system

really are what caused us to implement the Center concept originally. In 1973, our Secretary of Education at that time, became very concerned about how we were funding vocational education personnel development in Pennsylvania and whether we were funding basic programs or were we using Federal funds to fund over and above the normal teacher education programs. His opinion was that we were funding the basic programs. Basically, at that time we were funding twenty-eight different teacher education institutions. The funds were going to the institutions, but there was no accountability system. The funds were being used to support the basic vocational teacher education program. He saw no reason to give special funding to vocational education if it was running the same type of programs as the rest of teacher education. His plan was simply to reduce the funding by a third for three years until it disappeared. Fortunately, we were able to convince him and later Secretaries of Education that his plan was not appropriate. A task force was formed that had Department of Education staff along with teacher educators and representatives of education professional associations. Their charge was to do three things: first, to provide extensive rationale for administering federal and state funds for vocational education personnel development; second, to design funding strategy that would achieve the wisest use of funding resources; and third, to achieve a higher degree of accountability by recipients of basic funding support. In 1977, the development of the Center concept was completed. It was implemented in 1978 and you will be hearing more about the Center concept today. But, basically it provided for a critical mass concept. Those institutions that offered at least two undergraduate degree programs in vocational teacher education would be eligible to apply for funding in an initial contract with the department to provide services over and above the basic program. You will be hearing more about those services later. But, it was basically to provide as many as thirteen specific services. Four institutions met the criteria and were funded at that time. Centers were established at the University of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania State University, Indiana University of Pennsylvania and Temple University. You can see that they are geographically distributed across the state. Then, at that time, along with the Center funding and the contract each of the Centers signed with the Department there was a reporting mechanism in place. But, over time the system has continued to grow and change and become different at each Center. By 1983 or so each Center was submitting a very, very thick annual report documenting what was done. But the data were different from each Center and we were not able to combine it in a report that talked about what was happening to teacher education in Pennsylvania. Once again, the Secretary of Education questioned "are we getting the bang for the buck for our

teacher education dollars?" "Is what is happening at the Centers having a positive impact on vocational teachers?" Also, following that was a time when national reports were coming out on academic excellence followed by the Commission on Vocational Education Report. 1984 saw the Perkins Act. So, all of these things led us to, once again, examine the Center concept, using an outside group and PDE staff, we reaffirmed and issued a new position paper in 1985. And, at that time we also had several studies going on examining teacher education in Pennsylvania. Working with the Centers throughout this process we came to the realization that we needed to sit down and start from scratch in developing an accountability system that would satisfy PDE as well as the Centers.

MODERATOR: You answered several questions that I hoped to ask. However, what are we talking about in terms of dollars that have been going into these four Centers?

JACKIE CULLEN: A little over three million dollars.

MODERATOR: Jackie, what specifically is it that your Bureau in the PDE hoped to achieve with this accountability system?

JACKIE CULLEN: Several things. First of all the accountability system would provide data for decision-making at the state level. Also, the system would allow us to defend the system using up-to-date data. When we have new leaders the same questions are asked every three or four years. I think, also, it provides a mechanism that would allow for the Centers to identify areas where they need improvement.

MODERATOR: What do you see, Jackie as changes in the mode of operation for funding the Centers that might be made as a result of the implementation of this new system of accountability?

JACKIE CULLEN: I believe it is something that will evolve over time. For the first time I believe we will have consistent data across Centers and the Centers will be able to look at what the other Centers have done. For example what the costs are, in terms of costs per participant. I believe we will also be able to look at the effectiveness of activities from the current year, to help plan next year's activities. Perhaps it is a little early to say exactly what impact it will have on Center funding. I hope it will provide us with a defense for asking for increased funding.

MODERATOR: I like your statement relative to your hopes that the accountability system will be a source of helping you to seek additional funds. What do those of you from the

three university centers feel might evolve in terms of change of operation of the Centers as a result of this new accountability system?

TOM O'BRIEN: I think we will see a closer relationship between activities that are delivered out of the universities to the field in terms of meeting the criteria; consequently, we will see more commonalities between the four Centers. When teachers transfer from one area to another that there will not be a loss of program credits in meeting their certification and degree requirements. The new accountability system will continue to help to level out the programs so there is less inconsistency. Such an arrangement does encourage the sharing of materials and procedures and programs between the universities.

MODERATOR: You are saying the State doesn't have all four Centers operating in unison at the present time?

TOM O'BRIEN: No, we are not operating in unison. Each university has designed programs. We have shared information back and forth in terms of what we have designed and we have designed some common programs over the years. I think the new system will encourage greater consistency. Such effort will allow us to get a better handle on some evaluation we want to do and some research in terms of quality expectations that we have for vocational personnel preparation in the state.

TOM WALKER: This accountability system is going to lend itself to developing consistency internally with personnel assignments and duties. At Temple, the Center is a unit within the college of education and faculty can contract for part of their assignment. Unless you have each assignment defined in operational terms it is very difficult to provide continuity internally let alone in the field.

MODERATOR: Ed, can you cite any other possible changes in Center operation?

ED HERR: I think one of the things that has happened at Penn State (or I think will happen) is a somewhat different approach to the typical annual report process. In the event that, theoretically, we go through the accountability system in a comprehensive manner and if we do this well it will reduce the typical large scale narrative that one writes as a yearly synopsis of achievement. In addition, the annual proposal writing process will be given over much more directly to specific data about the needs for various fundable activity. In other words, you will say to the state you intend to engage in specific fundable activities and you will justify these kind of commitments by needs

assessment data. The annual proposal will be more number driven, more criterion related than narrative. By the same token, the final technical report, now written in narrative form, will also be in a format much more acceptable to computer processing, put on a disk the content of which is driven by whether we have met the criteria which we proposed for the Center for that year. I think from a product standpoint the annual proposal and the final technical report will likely be much easier to interpret. They will be much more sharply defined in terms of what happened, what was performed, who was served, how many people were served and the costs of each service category. Again, such a format will allow the state and the Centers to be clearer about the data than is likely with the larger narrative proposal we frequently write.

MODERATOR: How in the world did state people and university people ever get together on the collaborative effort to tackle something as terrible as an accountability system?

TOM WALKER: In preparation for this panel discussion, Cal talked to each of us over the phone and asked us if we would be responsibile for reporting on a particular aspect of the project. My assignment was "project procedures." In thinking about this assignment, I thought about events prior to getting involved with Cal and the accountability project. As Jackie explained, we have had Centers in Pennsylvania for several years. The Bureau (PDE) personnel has changed over the years and so too has Center and university personnel. The transience of personnel made it very difficult to achieve an even implementation of the Center concept across our Commonwealth. For several years we have talked about how we might improve the consistency of our personnel development services provided by Centers. During the semester prior to getting involved with this project, there were several discussions at Center directors' meetings that talked to the need for "formative evaluation," for putting in place a system that would in fact get at improving personnel development systems in the State. I believe that during that semester we began to build some of the bridges of trust that are required to implement a decentralized state-wide program. The Bureau of Vocational Education in our state department of education is interested in helping the universities to put together a system that will collect the information to improve Centers.

MODERATOR: Tom, will you please tell us how the task force was structured?

TOM WALKER: There were five representatives from the four Centers and five representatives from the Bureau of

Vocational Education. It just so happened four of the five Bureau personnel had recently become actively involved with the Centers.

MODERATOR: Then, what do you regard as the main component of this system?

TOM WALKER: It finally came to the point where the task force decided that the Bureau should contract with a person or persons from outside Pennsylvania to provide the services that were necessary. Because of our history, we felt we should look for someone who was versed in personnel development issues, someone who understood the Center model, and someone who was familiar with Pennsylvania. We all had an opportunity to identify individuals who we felt might fit the criteria. Each Center submitted names to the Bureau. Then, the Bureau reviewed our recommendations and contacted and interviewed individuals and finally offered the contract to Cal. At that point, as I understand it, Cal asked for background information. So, we loaded an UPS truck and sent him several years worth of reports and evaluations.

MODERATOR: Yes, I recall that I got more information than I really wanted!

TOM WALKER: It must have been. But, anyway, Cal was going to move through a process of taking a look at all of the background information, trying to glean from it the many characteristics of the system. Cal ultimately identified thirteen possible functions that Centers were to perform. What you need to know is that, historically, we had something like 16 or 17 possible functions to perform. Centers, based upon needs data, were able to contract for various components of the system. For example, Temple may have had 15 or 14 functions, Indiana may have had 16 or 12--whatever a Center could justify with needs data would translate into some activity for a particular function. Over the years, some of those functions were collapsed or altered. As I said earlier, Cal's analysis ultimately identified 13 functions that seemed to be getting the most attention in our state.

MODERATOR: These 13 functions were converted to possible objectives for the Centers. As you deal with those objectives, would you please share with us an outline of how the Task Force functioned?

TOM WALKER: As I recall, the first meeting of the Task Force involved putting some pretty broad parameters around the project itself and defining how the evaluation should proceed. We truly wanted it to be collaborative, we truly wanted it to be outcome oriented. We also wanted it to be

sensitive to the issues. We were concerned about making sure the Bureau, and the universities, had equal stakes invested in the total process. We were very sensitive about defining all of that. I might add that Cal came to the first meeting having done some background research on evaluation models. After he heard us talk about what we wanted and heard us describe the kind of affective components we wanted in the system, he suggested a Stufflebeam model: An evaluation model that would consider context, while considering input, process, and outcome. Once we had defined the evaluation aspect we actually worked on one of the Center activities with the hope of outlining a prototype. We worked a fundable activity into a performance objective and began to move it through a process that analyzed it from the standpoint of performance indicators, suggested evidence, and an associated rating scale. We took one activity that we thought all of the Centers had a great deal of experience with and one that operated fairly consistently across the entire state. At the same time we had to be sensitive to the Bureau because the Bureau kept us focused on what they were going to need from the system. They not only were going to need to know how each of these activities would manifest itself at a "Center" institution, but what development process, performance indicators, evidence and cost/service record data were agreed upon at an institution. And this is the Service Record.

MODERATOR: Do you want to share with us anything about how these initial performance objectives and cost/service records were developed?

TOM WALKER: This was a process of give and take -- each Center task force member took a turn at identifying the characteristics that best described the system at his or her institution. We agreed on some common performance material. It took us all day that first meeting just to move one activity through the analysis process. Because it was a give and take situation and, once again, because there were new people from the universities and Bureau at the meeting, there was a lot of educating going on.

MODERATOR: In addition to the development that followed for each of the objectives, there had to be some system operating in terms of getting reviews. Would you briefly describe that for us, Tom?

TOM WALKER: After we had the model in place Cal returned to his home. We had negotiated that by our next meeting we would like to see six activities developed to the same point as the prototype activity. So, Cal went back to Florida and started the process of doing a content analysis of the reports and evaluations we had sent him. He gleaned from

the reports enough information for all categories. Then, he started a dialogue with each of the Task Force members by mail. There were several passes of information to gain agreement on the wording for some of the objectives and the particular cost/service data that were needed. It was getting to the point where we were ready for our next meeting. We met again in Harrisburg as a group and did some fine tuning. Cal, again went back to Florida and did seven more activities/functions. The same process continued until we completed all of the objectives.

MODERATOR: I think we are ready to move into the product of the system. Ed Herr is going to carry the ball with this part. In terms of the product, how would you describe the basic structure of the system, Ed?

ED HERR: Basically, it reflects an accountability system. It has criterion referenced performance objectives, which have been developed or will be developed from the fundable activities of the Centers themselves. And the conceptual structure can be described as a context input process/product model. The input is represented by the funding of Center activities. The fundable activities define both process and product. The processes of the Centers are described by the performance objectives for each of the fundable activities. I suggest that on the one hand one product of the accountability system is the redefined and streamlined proposal for the funding and performance of each Center and another product is the annual technical report of the performance. The other set of products really has to do with the attainment of criteria set forth in the performance record and the data reported in the cost/service record for each Center. If you will, the performance record and the cost/service records summarize the products of the fundable activities, which are then reflected in the annual report. They are the performance connection from the annual proposal to the annual report. And, they give, as Tom has just suggested, on the one hand criteria to document the performance of the Center and performance indicators that one can use to study one's fundable activity through a series of stages, steps and requirements to make sure that one has met the criteria for a given fundable activity. Related to the performance record of the fundable activities is the cost/service record which gives the cost per function per person served or per fundable activity.

MODERATOR: You are going to refer to some illustrations in a moment. How about having the audience refer to page three of the handout. There is actually a better listing than we have on transparencies.

ED HERR: What we have on page 3 of the handout (Appendix) is a more specific listing of the fundable activities of Centers. Number 11 is "provide assistance for vocational educators serving handicapped learners." That can be done in a variety of ways. For example, one might be concerned about the needs of disadvantaged learners, developing strategy by which they can work effectively. Disadvantaged learners as a Center goal might be addressed in a CBTE format, workshop format, whatever the case might be. It depends on what you want to do. Number twelve in the handout -- "Provide assistance for vocational educators serving handicapped learners." Again, the same dimension. Number one on the list "Provide center management for vocational professional development", which really suggests that each Center has a variety of components, a variety of fundable activities, and a variety staff, outreach staff, primarily at the universities but also located at other places. Thus, the management system, its record keeping and documentation, becomes very important to keep the Center, in all its dimensions moving in the appropriate direction. We have so many different parts in a Center and many different people contribute their performance. Number two, or page 3 of the handout, is concerned with maintaining an occupational competency assessment program. Number 10 on the list is "Assist schools in using the Occupational Data Analysis System (ODAS) to develop and revise curricula." Each of these fundable activities become converted into performance objectives and each of them has a variety of stages of performance indicators by which they have been or might be met. Turn to page 4 of your handout, please. What you see there is an example of just one of the objectives - "Provide outreach services (Vocational Intern/Instructor certification program) for personnel off-campus through Field Based-Competency Based Teacher Education (FB-CBTE)" which is really 3 on page 3. In the listing of objectives this would be a performance record sample for item 3 of your fundable objectives on page 3. So, if you turn to Page 4 and 5, what you really see is the conversion of that objective, that particular fundable activity, into the performance indicators, which represent, if you will, the chronological stages, the tasks which are required to achieve that broad objective. The second column represents suggested evidence of the performance indicators and, of course, the rating scale. The evidence can vary somewhat, depending upon the Center's own staffing and how it is engaged in the process. That is why the form lists only <u>suggested</u> evidence. The performance indicators tend to be more standardized. The evidence as indicated may vary somewhat, depending on the indigenous characteristics at a particular center. Then, on page 6 of the handout, you see the Cost/Service Record. In the Cost/Service Record, what you are really trying to do is to determine how much it

costs to deliver each fundable activity at a particular Center and across the state; the cost/service record permits the state bureau to compute an average of how much money is being put into each fundable activity out of the three million dollars Jackie mentioned earlier. For example, how much of that money is going to provide adequate services to personnel off campus in field based-competency based teacher education? How much is going for occupational competency assessment? How much for ODAS, etc.? These data, then, can be computed both in terms of the Center and in terms of the average for the state. So, what you have here is both a cost dimension per objective and a service dimension. One can determine how many people actually have been served in the activity, what kind of competencies they are completing, the number of competencies they are completing and the number of competencies that have been completed. Obviously, the actual service would depend upon what the fundable activity would be. In some cases you are talking about workshops, not courses. In other cases you are talking about the schools served rather than individual clients. Or, the number of certificates being issued or recommended to the Pennsylvania Department of Education. So, again, the Service Record has to be defined in terms of what is required by the performance indicator and the fundable activity. The service dimension could vary somewhat. But, as you can see, you have an awful lot of comparative possibilities -- those within a Center or across Centers, but certainly in aggregate you can give some very detailed information to policy makers and state legislators and to others, about what the Centers are doing in specific personnel development terms. Obviously, it is quite possible that the current 13 fundable center activities or objectives will be modified as the personnel development needs of the state require additional fundable activities to be added or, in fact, it may well be that we will get to the point that certain existing fundable activities will not be needed and, therefore, there is built into the system, at least conceptually, the opportunity to modify these objectives so that the Centers can meet the state needs in a very systematic way. In that sense the cost/service record becomes a product which influences what is written in the final technical report. The assumption is that this material, this information, can be put on floppy disk, can be transmitted to the state in those forms to allow the state to much more economically and rapidly assimilate this information into their total data and planning bases.

MODERATOR: I believe, Ed, you indicated the Task Force came up with around 19 different items for the cost record and 53 or 54 different items in the service record. Would you care to lead off on any comments relative to what some of the

fears and anxieties might be of this system? It supposedly has been accepted by all four of the universities and by the Bureau of Adult and Vocational Education, but I am sure there might be some concerns.

ED HERR: I think there are. I do not know that the concerns are rampart. But, nevertheless, there are always concerns. I think that, as Cal has said, putting this system together requires a lot of trust. You have to assume that those in the state and your colleagues in other Centers are playing it quite straight that you are all in this together, that we are a collective enterprise trying to support each other. If you do not start with that assumption you have a very real problem of honest presentation of data. But, the fears, I suspect, are how will this comparative data, by function, by Center be used. It is assumed that there are all kinds of ways to aggregate this data and compare it. So, ultimately, one has to say that it may well be cheaper to do a particular activity at a particular Center than another Center. What does that mean to the Center which is more expensive? What does that mean in terms of state judgement about these data? That is a very tricky question. Will the context of the geography of the Centers really be appropriately included in the judgement about funding, explaining why some Centers may be more expensive than other Centers. To give you an example, the Centers really operate in three major service districts. The Center which I represent at Penn State University is by truism and maxim, I guess, equally inaccessible from everywhere, which is to say we have a very large Center, a very large university, in the middle of a whole lot of trees, lots of deer and bear, etc. And, so our area as compared to Tom's area is less densely populated and more geographically dispersed. But, the point is that Temple is located in basically an urban area. Obviously there are rural areas and semi-rural areas in their service area, too. But, there are more and larger concentrations of people and, therefore, the Temple Center delivery system is somewhat differently configured than are those of Penn State where, as I said, we have a lot of deer and bear as well as very few people for long stretches of our service area. So, we have to figure out how to deal with some of these issues. They may be farther apart than we think they are. We don't know. But, these data on costs of services, I think, will be helpful. Obviously, there are concerns such as, will cost/service differences heighten the competition for funds among the Centers? If that happens in a very dramatic way trust relations will be a little bit harder to maintain. In terms of some of the performance indicators that we have relative to competencies: how many competencies do certain people require when being served in field based programs or workshops? Again, what are the competencies one might

expect? How do you put numbers on some of those kinds of things?

MODERATOR: I believe one of the problems there, Ed, is that while each university has filed for and received program approval by the state agency they may not end up with all of the same competencies for a given program. This problem calls for the state to establish a set of minimum standards or number of specified competencies for each program to receive approval.

ED HERR: I think there are a number of fears and anxieties yet to be played out in terms of expectations about such competencies. I don't have them personally, but they are rather apparent in this kind of accountability.

MODERATOR: Any of the other regions wish to respond to the same question regarding fears and anxieties? Maybe Jackie might have some fears or anxieties relative to the State Director's position.

JACKIE CULLEN: I guess I would react to that statement differently for different kinds of universities. One is a Land Grant university, one is part of the state system of higher education and two are state related. Because of the nature of the different kinds of universities, there are different costs, and different administrative structures. There are different costs of servicing or delivering any one activity based upon the institution. I have concerns as to how to use the cost data. Obviously, when you are dealing with four different institutions you have institutional policies you need to take into consideration. An additional concern is the amount of time involved in data reporting. We must not allow it to grow cumbersome and time consuming for the Centers.

MODERATOR: I am happy to learn you have thrown away the scales for weighing those proposals and reports, Jackie.

TOM WALKER: I think the group, at our last meeting, expressed some concern about the perpetual description that Ed referred to and, as I recall, we agreed that the system would not be fully developed until we brought it to that particular point. I believe that was part of our charge as we moved into the next planning cycle. We tried to create the discussion around the context so that we could use context as part of the accountability system.

MODERATOR: As a matter of fact, one of the recommendations coming out in the final report had to do with getting at context. Now, I believe we are ready to get a little more

detail on implementation. Tom, would you share that with us?

TOM O'BRIEN: On page 7 of the handout (Appendix) you may observe time sequence that we go through as Centers in working up our materials to be sent to the Bureau for consideration for funding. It starts with July 1 being our Christmas. We receive money on that date for that year. So, we get a Christmas in July in Pennsylvania. The review meetings and process that you see beyond that, indicate there is a little more detail in terms of what goes on during the year related to Centers and our interaction with the Bureau and with other Centers as we plan activities across the state. You'll notice there are a number of meetings with state agency personnel as we either go into their offices or they are out to visit with us at the universities and to spend time with the Centers and also with university administration, if you would, where the Centers are housed. As you look at the list of Center objectives (fundable activities) please notice most of them are non-traditional types of activities that are delivered through the Center, delivered in the field based delivery system, which means they are off-campus in a lot of situations. Some of them are unique services that have a tendency to parallel other services the university may provide in terms of placement, student record keeping, accountability. So, there is a continuous process going on in keeping university people knowledgeable of what a Center is doing and why we are doing certain activities. As you look at this there is a chance, for example, for us to go into a midyear review in January, which again is part of our evaluation process, in terms of formative evaluation, we are looking at what is going on in the first half of the year and how we might adjust that or what additional data we would need to collect in order to verify that we are providing services for which we have been funded. So, this is a continuing process. What you don't see up here is a requirement that we use advisory committees for strategic planning during the year to verify all of the activities that are going on within a Center. There is a very elaborate process that brings the field into our operation or to the Center operation to review and make recommendations as to how activities will be formulated, how funds will be spent, and where these activities will take place, for example, in a given region. That also gives the Bureau an opportunity to look at, in essence, a client feedback system that goes back to the teachers, the administrators, the school district and ask what kind of services have we provided. It is a double check kind of mechanism or safety check, if you please, in the system. It is not represented on this chart.

MODERATOR: Each one of the performance records does call for needs assessment, as I recall. What is the kind of activity that would go on for needs assessment.

TOM O'BRIEN: In order to do an activity, we must perform a needs assessment to indicate if there is a critical mass of individuals or schools who want a particular service. We also must do some type of a priority of that, we have "x" number of dollars to spend in a particular activity against the 13 objectives. One activity may be emphasized in a given year more than in a previous year or future years. We then need to establish objectives to meet each of those as common and, as Ed indicated, look at how we are going to evaluate ourselves, how the field is going to evaluate them. Then, basically, come down to do the cost analysis that is related to that.

MODERATOR: How are you going to go about collecting Cost/Service record data? There has been some rumor that you might have to hire sixteen additional people.

TOM O'BRIEN: The university accounting systems do not give us the kind of detail that need to be verified. If you look at the sheets that Ed mentioned in the packet in terms of cost data, each Center, in essence, is required to set up its own accounting system. We, at IUP, have set up a system in- house that is operated within our office that does two things. It gives us this cost data and also protects us within the university from losing funds through their accounting systems, which aren't very accurate. We find lots of times that our soft money grants get charged inappropriately for expenditures that we have not incurred and we are constantly fighting with them to keep their fingers out of our money. For protection, we use an in-house purchasing and accounting system that is computerized. We find that data entry and tracking takes a lot of time and we are now moving into bar code technology to put down the costs so it is very realistic to use within that system. It also works in terms of services to the students, for example, if you take a look at page 4 of the handout, performance indicators numbers 3 and 4 on this particular activity require record keeping for performance assessment, etc. For this purpose, we have a record keeping system computerized that indicates every contact with a teacher. This one calls for new teachers to get a contact once every two weeks. Again, this information is being converted to a bar coding entry system. We currently do it with the field people filling out a form, bringing it in so it can be entered into the computer system. Two people are now in the process of changing that over to a bar code entry system check-off and it makes it very simple for a work study student to computerize the data. We do not have to use a

secretary, which keeps cutting our costs. One of the major issues of the Center is to continually look at processes to determine how we can cut costs to be more efficient.

MODERATOR: In terms of using the performance records and cost/service records, I assume that you are concerned not only about formative evaluation of the Center and its function, but also about the formative evaluation of the accountability system.

TOM O'BRIEN: That is correct. The system is a very important factor. There is consistency in terms of data that is entered, how it is collected is consistent, we use instruments that we have used over a period of time. In other words, we are sure we are collecting the same types of data each time out. We do make a lot of comparisons of data internally. As Ed pointed out, this kind of system has a number of functions if you compare between Centers, that is the purpose. But, one of the largest uses is from the management standpoint internally within the Center is to compare what has happened to us this year over the previous year and what kind of modifications we need to make in order to operate more effectively and efficiently.

MODERATOR: So, you use an internal evaluation process?

TOM O'BRIEN: That is correct.

MODERATOR: You have indicated by what media you intend to be communicating with the state agency. Floppy disk, primarily. Is that correct?

TOM O'BRIEN: At the present time, one of the bureau staff members is developing a program on "d" base that will be used to enter our data so that we have a common format for entering data from the Centers which will make our lives easier. We can enter that on floppy disk and send the floppy disk with hard copy backup as compared to a lot of other data collection we did in the past and also that can be used for comparison between Centers or within Centers on activities.

MODERATOR: What, in your last meeting, was the tentative agreement about this comparison among the Centers in terms of the cost/service record data?

TOM O'BRIEN: I believe there will be some cost comparisons done. However, these will be done through examining state averages, etc., as opposed to examining each individual Center's data. We have agreed not to share individual Center reports with other Centers. Again, I think Jackie's concern, from the Bureau standpoint is important. That is,

the need to look at data across Centers in terms of what context and policies each of us live with in our system. What I would anticipate will come out of that is that we will probably move away from the cost analysis at that level and look for at an outcome level in terms of our impact on professional development and in particular classroom teaching/learning activities that go on. I think as we grow in this process, and as we move forward in it, we will start looking at our impact into the educational system more as an indicator of how well we are working with personnel. We then can start looking at outcome measurements more objectively.

MODERATOR: As I understand the agreement, you will not necessarily be sharing data from one institution to another. It will be up to the state office to compile, analyze and then give you averages, and so on. It will not be a direct exchange saying Temple did this, Indiana did this, Penn State did thus and so. But, you will probably each know who did what regardless how you go about handling it. You have said that you are going to use the floppy disks and printouts from your computer to the extent that you can reduce the amount of volume of your proposals as well as the final report.

TOM O'BRIEN: That is correct. I think each Center has taken a hard look at reducing the size of proposals and requests. I would anticipate over a period of time that we will probably get into some standardization of the proposal process. In our particular case, we are using Ventura Publishing to print that document out each time. We have been on WordStar for a number of years. This program makes it easy to generate the document by simply taking the needs data that we collect each year and go back through the document and enter the newest needs data along with last year's so that we have a fairly decent historical track of what has happened in particular areas of the Center.

MODERATOR: What is the schedule for implementation? When are you going to have the first output of the system?

TOM O'BRIEN: Implementation is during this academic year. We will be examining the kinds of data that will be collected via the data base system that is being developed and we will be writing our proposals for this coming year, which will be the funding of July 1989 against this system. And, that will be the year (July 1, 1989 to June 30, 1990) for which we will also collect data in compliance with the new accountability system.

MODERATOR: The process would begin with the proposal in March and by July 1 you would have your Christmas in July

for the following 1989-1990 school year. So, it would be the Fall of 1990 before you would have data to be analyzed at the state level.

TOM O'BRIEN: That would be the end of the first cycle.

MODERATOR: For the benefit of our audience, what anticipated advantages do you panel members see in this accountability system? You have mentioned various ones. Please comment on some of these that you have cited during your presentations to summarize the high points. First one, dealing with communication. I recall that the five members from the state agency really wondered why you needed all of this performance record stuff? What happened?

TOM O'BRIEN: There was a discussion. I think they were looking to boil the data down to a smaller amount than we were. But, from a management standpoint of operating a Center within a university that does deliver non-traditional kinds of activities, we have, as you might guess, some major communication problems in-house at times describing what it is that we do and why and why we have certain kinds of leeway in some of the operations that we do, etc. So, I think the people managing the Centers built a case saying the data we need to collect do one of two things. One, is the accountability that we have performed it. Two, that it is a formative evaluation process ongoing, that we can make continuous changes in our system. We want to make sure that we are collecting enough data that we can do that.

MODERATOR: Why is it that you mention trust as being one of the advantages of this system?

TOM O'BRIEN: I think trust became critical as the Centers evolved from the standpoint that we had different players come in and out of the system, at the state level, at the university level. This system gives us a common base in which to discuss items or activities that are going on. So, that we at least have a common place to come off from a particular activity and there is a meeting of the minds.

MODERATOR: Any further comment relative to evaluation, the self-evaluation or external evaluation you see as an advantage to the system.

TOM O'BRIEN: I think one of the other advantages that we tend to overlook is the fact that we model out of the Center what it is that we would like to have happen in the school system in terms of evaluation, in terms of self-evaluation, the potential outcome, etc. I think another spinoff effect of Centers is managing personnel development as we do, is

that we model for the schools, for administrators and teachers the kind of behavior, for the kinds of activities, the performances we would like to see in the schools. So, we do have criteria that we hold ourselves to. We are competency based for performance. We evaluate ourselves, we are continually conducting self-evaluation. But, I think that is another spinoff that may not have been an intentional outcome at the beginning, that has now become an integral part of the Center process.

MODERATOR: How do you see this system helping you in maintaining support, that is financial support for the Center?

TOM WALKER: We have probably cut across the previous two ends. Communications, trust and now willingness to support. Prior to the whole process, if you were to pick up our state plan for vocational education the description for personnel development centers consumed a few lines. A positive outcome of this particular project was that we now find that the state plan has Centers very well defined. My feeling was that as political parties changed in Harrisburg, as legislative teams came in and out, it was very easy to pick up the state plan and take a look at it and say, "well what is this three million dollars doing, what is a Center?" The plan did not describe the Centers very well. Each time there was a new Governor and a new team, it seemed we had to defend the Center concept. I am not so sure this won't still be the case in the future, but I believe we do have a better base for describing what we do and for explaining the expense for what we do. And, hopefully, we will have the service data to back it up.

MODERATOR: Anyone else care to comment? I believe that maintaining support is a very important advantage that the Task Force realized. The panel members have talked about simplifying reporting. Jackie has mentioned that she will have better ammunition in defense of personnel development when she goes to the powers that be, including the legislature, for funds. Panel members have commented on the results of the accountability system being used for program improvement purposes. They have commented, too, on management. How internally it will help them in terms of having clearly defined responsibilities for the coordinators of the various functions or objectives. As they change personnel, it will be easier to keep track of and be sure that services called for are being performed in accordance with the plan. Obviously, all of this is done for program improvement. The panel members have indicated that they are going to be dedicated in trying to improve the accountability system, too, as time rolls along.

Now, perhaps some of you would have questions that you would like to ask the panel members.

APPENDIX

ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

FOR

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT

IN PENNSYLVANIA: A COLLABORATIVE EFFORT

Materials prepared to supplement a presentation
for the
American Vocational Education Personnel Development Association

by

C. J. Cotrell, Moderator
Jacqueline Cullen
Edwin Herr
Thomas O'Brien
Thomas Walker

American Vocational Association Convention
St. Louis, Missouri
December 4, 1988

ABSTRACT

This project was originated in response to a mutual need for better communication between the Pennsylvania Department of Education, Bureau of Vocational and Adult Education (BVAE) and four universities in Pennsylvania operating vocational education professional personnel development Centers. The purpose of the project was to design an accountability system for the professional personnel development Centers through a cooperative effort with Center directors and state staff. The objectives of the project were: 1) Develop measurable process and product objectives for each fundable Center activity; 2) Design a recordkeeping system with a procedure compatible for computer application to provide cost and other pertinent data; 3) Design an instrument for collecting information from staff regarding time, travel, etc., pertinent to each Center activity; and 4) Design a procedure for formative and summative evaluation of Center activity which uses both internal and external personnel.

The procedures for the project included the following: A Task Force was organized in January 1988 to coordinate the collaborative effort and advise the project director. During the initial meeting of the Task Force consisting of 10 members (five from each, the BVAE and the universities) the broad specifications for a system design were developed. A computer search was initiated for relevant accountability systems or models. The basic design for this accountability system was derived from task force deliberations. A sample for one function of Centers was outlined during the first Task Force meeting. The consultant/project director completed a content analysis of proposals and technical reports of the Centers to develop the performance record consisting of assessment criteria and relevant cost/service items for each Center objective as a fundable activity. As materials were developed, they were mailed to the Task Force members for review individually prior to formal meetings. Recommended revisions were discussed and agreed upon in meetings of the total Task Force. During a meeting in March, the original draft of the accountability system materials was approved by the Task Force; also, a schedule was established for conferring with the personnel at each of the Centers to review the system and obtain additional input. The meetings at each Center were completed in April and the suggested improvements were developed and mailed to the Task Force for review and approval. The system's design was evaluated by three outside reviewers as well as other appropriate members of the BVAE.

The Task Force approved the materials and schedule of yearly activities for the implementation of the system on June 16, 1988. Recommendations relative to implementation of the accountability system were developed. Cost/Service data will be produced during 1989-90. State-wide statistics will be examined for the first time in November 1990.

Currently Identified
Fundable Center Objectives*

1. Provide center management for vocational professional personnel development
2. Develop and maintain a comprehensive Occupational Competency Assessment (OCA) Program
3. Provide outreach services (Vocational Intern/instructor certification program) for personnel off-campus (a) Undergraduate Courses (b) FB-CBTE
4. Provide outreach services (vocational education curriculum specialist, supervisor and director certification program) for personnel off-campus (a) Graduate Courses (b) FB-CBLT
5. Provide workshops and seminars for personnel from all vocational content areas
6. Provide pre-induction, professional education for clients recruited from business and industry with little or no pedagogical education or experience
7. Provide an Occupational Experience Program
8. Provide placement services for vocational professional personnel
9. Provide a recruitment system for vocational teachers and leadership personnel
10. Assist schools in using the Occupational Data Analysis System (ODAS) to develop and revise curricula
11. Provide assistance for vocational educators serving disadvantaged learners
12. Provide assistance for vocational educators serving handicapped learners
13. Provide support for a research arm in vocational education

* Order of listing does not necessarily indicate priority.

PERFORMANCE RECORD

Objective: Provide outreach services (Vocational Intern/Instructor certification program) for personnel off-campus through Field Based-Competency Based Teacher Education (FB-CBTE)

Performance Indicators	Suggested Evidence	Rating Scale
1. Clients' needs were assessed	1.1 Results of surveys to support need cited/recorded	NA Yes No
2. Prospective clients were informed of FB-CBTE program and requirements	2.1 A 25% sample of prospective clients was contacted to determine if they received timely information	NA Yes No
3. New teachers were observed once each week	3.1 Documented, teachers' records and staff travel	NA Yes No
4. Experienced teachers were observed once each two weeks	4.1 Documented, teachers' records and staff travel	NA Yes No
5. Individualized helping conferences were provided	5.1 Documented, teachers' records	NA Yes No
6. Opportunities were provided for collegial interaction	6.1 Documented, teachers' records	NA Yes No
7. Offerings were modularized and self-paced	7.1 Documented, teachers' record of progress	NA Yes No
8. Clients making less than average progress were counseled	8.1 Documented/signed-off on teachers' records	NA Yes No
9. Staff (resource person) participated in regular training weekly	9.1 Record of meetings documented	NA Yes No
10. Staff engaged in meetings regularly	10.1 Documented record of meetings	NA Yes No
11. Modules were appropriate for specific needs of clients served	11.1 Documented record of yearly review of modules	NA Yes No

Objective: Provide outreach services (Vocational Intern/Instructor certification program) for personnel off-campus through Field Based-Competency Based Teacher Education (FB-CBTE)(contd.)

Performance Indicators	Suggested Evidence	Rating Scale
12. Clients evaluated the total delivery system regularly	12.1 Documented record of yearly evaluation of staff, curriculum and delivery methods	NA Yes No
13. Vocational Instructional II certificated resource persons were involved in helping clients served	13.1 Documented record of "local supervisor" reviewing competency attainment	NA Yes No
14. Competency evaluation panel functioned in each school	14.1 Documented teacher records	NA Yes No
15. Senior teacher educator supervised work of all field and resident resource persons including service in competency evaluation panel	15.1 Documented, teachers' records and teacher educator report	NA Yes No
16. Competencies and an attainment scale were used for each certification level	16.1 Documented teachers' records	NA Yes No
17. A process was in place for evaluating competencies of clients transferring among Centers	17.1 Documented by written policy	NA Yes No

SAMPLE

6

COST/SERVICE RECORD

Objective: Provide outreach services (Vocational Intern/Instructor certification program) for personnel off-campus through Field Based-Competency Based Teacher Education (FB-CBTE)

Cost

Total cost _____

Cost per competency completed (TPO) _____

Service

Number of teachers served _____

Number of competencies completed (TPO) _____

Average number of competencies (TPO) completed per client _____

Number of certificates issued/recommended to PDE:

Voc. I _____

Voc. II _____

Instr. I _____

Instr. II _____

Number of certificate endorsements for Co-operative Education recommended to PDE _____

SCHEDULE OF YEARLY EVENTS FOR THE ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

July 1		State agency funding of the Centers
June or July	(1)	State agency (end of the year) review meeting with Center directors and Bureau program personnel
Sept. 30		The Centers' fiscal and technical reports are due for previous year
Nov. 1	(1)(2)	State agency combination review of cost/service record state-wide statistical summary and preliminary planning meeting with Center directors
Mid-Nov.	(1)	State agency site visits to each of the Centers
Dec.	(2)	State agency planning meeting with Center directors
Jan.		State agency mailing of guidelines for funding for next fiscal year
Jan.	(1)	State agency mid-year review meeting with Center directors
Jan.		Center self-evaluation (mid-year) with assessment criteria from the performance record for objectives
March		Centers' proposals for funding and recertification as Center due for next fiscal year
Mid-April	(1)	State agency site visits to each Center
May		Center self-evaluation (end of year) with assessment criteria from the performance record for objectives

Notes: 1 The central thrust of state agency site visits and review meetings will be checking progress and developing solutions to problems to assist each Center to accomplish the objectives set forth in its proposal for funding.

2 The main purpose of the planning meetings will be to discuss state-wide needs for professional personnel development and to determine the priority of the various objectives for the Centers' functions during the next fiscal year. Regional and state-wide needs assessment data for the next year should be available for use in these meetings.

ROSTER OF TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Richard Adamsky	Director, Center for Vocational Education Professional Personnel Development, Temple University
James Bishop	Personnel Development Coordinator, BVAE, PDE
Clarence Dittenhafer	Research Associate, Research, Evaluation and Data Management Section, BVAE, PDE
Edwin Herr	Director, Center for Vocational Education Professional Personnel Development, Pennsylvania State University
Carolyn Kratz	Head, Curriculum and Personnel Development Section, BVAE, PDE
Ruth Lungstrum	Director, Center for Vocational Education Professional Personnel Development, University of Pittsburgh
Thomas O'Brien	Director, Center for Vocational Personnel Preparation, Indiana University of Pennsylvania
William Reilly	Chief, Division of Vocational Education Planning, Development and Evaluation Services, BVAE, PDE
Thomas Walker	Co-Director, Center for Vocational Education Professional Personnel Development, Temple University
Thomas Winters	Head, Research, Evaluation and Data Management Section, BVAE, PDE
Calvin J. Cotrell	Consultant/Project Director